## INDEX

or

## EXHIBITS

	Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
•	664	2351		Address of His Royal Highness Prince Wan Waithayakon, representative from Thaila at the Greater East Asia Conference, November 1943		18021
	665	2352		Address of His Excellency Nr. Jose P. Laurel, representative of the Philippines at the Greater East Asia Conference, November 1943		18021
	666	2352		Address of His Excellency Dr. Ba-Ho, representative from Burma at the Greater East Asia Conference, November 1943		18021
5	206E(11)	2354		Excerpt from Diary of former U. S. Ambassador Grew entitled "Ten Years in Japan" (p.303)		18025

Monday, 10 Harch 1947

2

3

.

.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

13

19

21

22

23 24

25

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

## Appearances:

For the Tribunal, same as before.

with the addition of: MR. WILLIAM E. EDWARDS of Cleveland, Ohio, formerly Chief of the Office of Special Investigations, War Production Board and counsel for the Defense Plant Corporation in the United States.

For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.) G 1 2 d 2 b 3 e 4 g

MARSHAI OF THE COURT. The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except TOJO, SHIGEMITSU, and KAYA, who are represented by their respective counsel. We have certificates from the prison surgeon at Sugamo Prison, certifying that the accused SHIGE-MITSU, TOJO, and KAYA are too ill to attend the trial today. The certificates will be recorded and filed.

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal:

when I presented to the Tribunal a few days ago those who have recently arrived as counsel for the prosecution, one of the gentlemen was ill and I couldn't present him. I would like to do so now. This is Mr. William E. Edwards, of Cleveland, Ohio. He was formerly Chief of the Office of Special Investigations, War Production board, and then was counsel for the Defense Plant Corporation in the United States.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. EDVARDS: Thank you.

& '6 K a 7 P 8 e 9 u 10

14

11

12

13

17 18

16

19

20 21

22

23

24

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

. .

..

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I am informed that the witness is not present.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any explanation of his absence:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. President, I understand that there may be some delay because of transportation difficulties. As far as we know, he is going to be here and we expect him momentarily.

THE PRESIDENT: He should be here or we should be told why he isn't.

MR. ROBERTS: I have another witness ready. We could stand this witness down and proceed with the next witness, if the Court so please.

THE PRESIDENT: Call your next witness, Mr. Roberts.

MK ROBERTS: I call MURATA Shozo.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SHOZO MURATA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through the Japanese interpreter as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KOBERTS: Q Mr. MURATA, what was your occupation prior to 1940? THE PRESIDENT. Ask him his full name and address. That is all that is necessary. He hasn't sworn to either yet. BY THE PRESIDENT: What is your full name and address, Witness Name: MURATA Shozo. My address is Tamagawa, Setagaya Ward, City of Tokyo. Q What is your occupation? A Previously I was president of the Osaka Shosen Kaisha Shipping Company. BY MR. ROBERTS: Are you at present confined to Sugamo Prison? Yes, I have been confined there since the year before last.

& What position did you occupy subsequent

to 1940?

second KONOYE Cabinet.

A As I said before, I was president of the O.S.K, or Osaka Shosen Kaisha, in 1940, and then president of the Japan Testiles Association, and in July of that year I became Communications Minister, and concurrently, Railways Minister in the

There seems to have been some error. May
I point it out?

THE INTERPRETER: Correction in translation: "I was president of the Japan Ship Owners Association" instead of "Japan Textiles Association."

Q Thereafter what appointment did you receive?

A Thereafter I resigned, together with the third KONOYE Cabinet, in 1941, and in the following year, 1942, in the month of February, I went to the Philippines as adviser to the War Ministry.

Q How long did you stay in the Philippines:

A I remained in the Philippines as adviser, and following the grant of independence to the Philippines I was appointed Ambassador Plenipotentiary, and have remained in the Philippines ever since October 1943.

25

Until what date? 1 A I resigned in July 1944. 2 I believe you stated that you were sent to 3 the Philippines as an adviser. Will you please tell us what kind of adviser you were appointed 5 as? 7 From the very first I have no military 8 knowledge or experience. My chief function was 9 principally connected with economics and, second-10 arily, politics. was it in the capacity of economic adviser, 12 then, that you were sent to the Philippines? 13 There was no special appointment to that 14 effect. 15 Q What were your duties? 16 A At that time I was asked by the then Frime 17 Minister, TOJO, to go to the Philippines and just 18 stay in the Philippines, and that was all he wanted 19 of me, and thereafter, after going to the Philippines, 20 my own conduct and action depended upon my own per-21 sonal judgment. 22 Were you familiar with some of the facts 23

surrounding organization of the Greater East Asia

conference in November 1943?

A At that time I was in the Philippines, the post to which I was assigned, and I was informed for the first time by telegram from the Government that such a conference or assembly was convened

Q Did you discuss this conference with Lr. Laurel?

A Of course.

Q Will you tell us what Mr. Leurel had to say?

A First of all, I showed Doctor Laurel the telegram I had received from Tokyo. After showing the telegram I asked for his views and he showed -- expressed enthusiastic approval of the idea. He not only approved; he rejoiced over the plan to hold such a conference.

He went on to say that this had been in his mind for a long time -- this of all things had been in his mind for a long time -- and that it was entirely consistent with the ideas and thoughts which he held dear to himself, and that although he had been president of the Philippines for only one month, he would surmount any obstacles so that he may personally participate in this assembly.

3

1

2

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Did he say enything about having written on this point of view previously to the time you spoke to him?

A Of course he didn't express enything in writing at the time of our meeting, but having had intimate relations with him for two years previous to that, I know from his -- from the words and the actions, from his books, from his addresses, and from his conversations that he had entertained such ideas for some time past.

O Do you know by whem Mr. Laurel was elected president?

A By the newly -- by the new constitution of the Fhilippines. By provision of that constitution the National Assembly was created and called, and in accordance with other provisions in the constitution he was elected president by that National Assembly.

Q Did you speak to Mr. Laurel about the conference on his return to Manila from Tekyo?

A Yes, of course. Immediately after he returned, the subject was brought up by him.

- Q What did he say?
- A He was extremely satisfied.
- Q Did he comment on Japan's treatment of and

represented at that conference?

A As head -- He was treated, he said, as

head of state, and that the autonomy and independence of the Philippiner was fully recognized, and he said that the fact of autonomy and independence, as stipulated in one of the articles of the Joint Declaration, was revealed while at the conference in fact, and that he had returned home greatly impressed and greatly overjoyed.

Q Did he make any comment about the speeches that were delivered by the other delegates?

A At that time he was not only impressed by the speeches of the other representatives — the representatives of other nations represented at the Council — at the Assembly, but he was extremely elated over the opportunity he had in having friendly relations with the representatives of the other nations, all of whom he said were fine men and leaders, and that he had told these men that if possible he wanted all these delegates to return to their respective countries by way of Manila.

Q Did any of the delegates actually stop at Marila on their way back?

A Of course the delegates from Manchukuo

1,3

and China were unable to come to Manila, but all others did, with the exception of Prince Wanwai Thayakon, of Thailand, who, because of plane schedule, although he had intended to visit Manila, was unable to make the visit. Otherwise all other delegates visited Manila and were all royally welcomed and treated by President Laurel at his own official residence during their stay.

Q You stated that you knew Mr. Laurel for two

You stated that you knew Mr. Laurel for two years and became very familiar with him. Will you tell us what type of man you observed him to be?

A Speaking of Doctor Laurel's character, I should say he is a great patriot and a man of very strong character -- strong will. Doctor Laurel was a very inspired and ardent patriot who greatly revered the Philippine hero Rizal, and was extremely enthusiastic and seriously concerned with the development of the Philippines, and every Sunday while I was there he gathered together a group of Philippine leaders and gave lectures and talks on morality.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I am extremely reluctant to keep on objecting to this type of evidence, but, in my submission, the witness' op-

inion of Mr. Laurel's personal character is entirely irrelevant, and the whole of the evidence of this witness as far as it has gone can, in my submission, carry the Tribunal nowhere. 

THE PRESIDENT: Who the representatives 14 0 1 were at the conference and what they said and did r 2 there is perhaps relevant, but not this. The objection C is upheld. 8 19 I should have let you say what you wished to 5 say, but actually it is too obvious to waste time on. BY MR. ROBERTS (Continued): 7 Mr. MURATA, what position did Mr. Laurel occupy 8 prior to the time he was elected President of the Philippines? 10 He was Interior Commissioner of the Executive 11 Commission of the Philippines headed by Mr. Vargas. 12 Do you know what position he occupied with 13 relation to the Nacionalista Party? 14 I think it was at the time of the Commonwealth 15 Government under President Curzon, Dr. Laurel was a 16 justice of the Supreme Court, if I recall correctly. 17 I refer to his position in the Nacionalista 18 Party in the Philippines. 19 20 I think he was a member of the Nacionalista Party, but I have not heard other than the fact that he 21 22 was a justice of the Supreme Court. 23 MR. ROBERTS: Does any other defense counsel 24 desire to examine at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

```
MR. FURNESS: I may wish to call Mr. MURATA
 on the individual case of the defendant whom I represent.
   therefore wish to reserve the right to do so.
          THE PRESIDENT: Any cross-examination?
4
          Mr. Comyns Carr.
5
                      CROSS-EXAMINATION
  BY MR. COMYNS CARR:
           There is only one question, Mr. MURATA. Do
you remember being asked some questions by this gentle-
10 man here, Mr. Sutton?
      A I have, I remember.
11
           Did he ask you this question: "What economic
12
13 exploitation was carried on by Japan in the Philippines
14 and by what means?"
           NR. ROBERTS: I object, if your Honor please.
15
16 This is assuring a fact which is not in evidence. If the
17 Court please, it is outside the scope of the examination.
           THE PRESIDENT: This could go to credit. I
18
19 don't know why Mr. Carr is asking it though.
20
           MR. ROBERTS: He might examine him as to the
  substance of the material.
22
           THE PRESIDENT: I am thinking hard what value
23
  had the evidence at all.
24
           MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, with regard to
25
  the evidence he has given already, I would take the same
```

view, but as he has given evidence that he was the representative of Japan in the Philippines and of his doings there, I thought perhaps I might ask him a question on that subject which is relevant to the case. THE PRESIDENT: But we must limit your crossexamination to matters arising out of the examination in chief, unless you question him as to credit. IR. COMYNS CARR: This doesn't go to credit, your Honor. I submit, it arises out of the examination 10 in chief having regard to the fact that he deposed 11 that he was the representative of the Japanese Government 12 in the Philippines. 13 THE PRESIDENT: He didn't testify about the 14 economic situation, though. 15 MR. COMYNS CARR: Does your Honor -- I am sorry, 16 I didn't hear before. 17 THE PRESIDENT: Are you pressing the question? 18 MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor thinks not, 19 I don't wish to. 20 THE PRESIDENT: I don't think the Tribunal 21 desires to hear any more examination of this witness. 22 He is released on the usual terms. 23 (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 24 THE PRESIDENT: "ell, have you found out what 25 happened to the witness before the last?

IR. ROBERTS: No, we have not, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: "bat do you propose to do now? IR. ROBERTS: I have just received word that 3 he will be here in about 30 minutes. In the interim I can proceed to introduce certain documents into evidence. "e now respectfully offer in evidence exhibit No. 2322, marked for identification only, which is the Atlantic Charter, in order to compare certain articles in that instrument with certain articles and principles contained in the Joint Declaration contained in prosecution exhibit No. 1346. 11 THE PRESIDENT: The proper place to do that 12 13 is in your summation, Mr. Roberts. IR. ROBERTS: I would like to offer the Atlantic 14 Charter in evidenc for that purpose then, if your Honor 15 16 please. 17 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted. 18 MR. TAVENNER: Your Honor, it is my recollection 19 that that document was offered and read. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Well, we judicially noticed 21 it in any event. It is marked for identification accord-22 ing to Mr. Roberts. 23

MR. ROBERTS: Has your Honor admitted it into

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

24

25

evidence?

IR. ROBERTS: I did not intend to read it, but 2 it was objected to, simply to call attention in similarity 3 between Article IV and V in this instrument and the Joint Declaration. CLERK OF THE COURT: Is that defense document 6 159? MR. ROBERTS: Yes. It is marked 2322 for 7 identification later. CLERK OF THE COURT: It has already been marked. 9 10 IR. ROBERTS: Yes. "e now offer in evidence documents No. 664, 11 12 665 and 666, being the speeches of three of the representatives at the Greater East Asia Conference. This is an excerpt from prosecution exhibit No. 1347 for identific-15 ation. 16 THE PRISIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 17 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 664 18 will receive exhibit No. 2351, document No. 665 will 19 receive exhibit No. 2352 and document No. 666 will 20 receive exhibit No. 2353. 21 ("hereupon, the documents above re-22 ferred to were marked defense exhibit Nos. 664, 23 665, 666 and received in evidence.) 24 MR. ROBERTS: I would like permission, if the 25 Court please, to read from the original manuscript.

mimeographing is not too good.

THE PRESIDENT: Before you read give us copies please.

"hat is happening, Mr. Roberts?

MR. ROBERTS: Evidently the Court copies were left in my office instead of being brought up here by distribution. The page is now on his way to bring them here. I can proceed to read the first document, if your Honors have no objection.

THE PRESIDENT: We have. "e must have copies. Better proceed with the next document, Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: We now offer in evidence defense document No. 206E-11 for the purpose of showing the understanding of the United States Ambassador Grew concerning the New Order in East Asia. This an excerpt from exhibit No. 2306 for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Your Honor, we object to document 206E-11 being offered in evidence as it is no more than an excerpt from the diary of ex-Ambassador Grew, which contains his opinion on these matters and is not such as would assist the Tribunal in coming to a conclusion on the matters at issue in the case.

THE PRESIDENT: If it contains relevant and material statements of fact as well, we will admit

it to that extent.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I don't know whether the Tribunal has this document before it but a most cursorv glance would indicate that there is no statement of fact contained therein at all, and rather than encumber the record with a document which will prove of no value to the Tribunal we suggest that it be excluded now.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts, we are not going to put Mr. Grew in the position of deciding matters which we are required to decide.

MR. ROBERTS: I didn't get the full statement of your Honor.

THE FRESIDENT: We will not admit Mr. Grew's opinions.

PR. ROBERTS: We submit, if your Honor please, he was in a position to realize the meaning of certain phrases and events and we think it will help the Court to determine the fair meaning.

THE PRESIDENT: We cannot delegate our functions, if we wanted to, Mr. Roberts. Does this contain statements of fact which are relevant and material?

MR. LOGAN: May I say a word, if the Tribunal please, with respect to this? The same objection --

your help but we must confine the argument to one counsel on each side. The questions I am asking are very simply answered. The objection is upheld.

Honor please, there are statements of fact in this document and that the prosecution has in a similar manner introduced statements by Ott, I believe, telegram excerpts.

THE PRESIDENT: We upheld the objection of the prosecution simply because you allowed their statement that this document contained opinion only to bass unchallenged. We gave you liberal opportunity to challenge th t and you didn't. You come now with your challenge. It is rather late. You should wear the earphones and should listen to what I say, Mr. Roberts, and not go away from the lectern to the table. If you assure us that these documents contain statements of fack I have no doubt it is the desire of the Tribunal to admit them. On your assurance that they do contain statement of fact we rescind the order upholding the objection and we admit it on the usual terms. If or reading them we find they do not contain statements of fact which are relevant and material we will reject them again.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 206 E (11) will receive exhibit No. 2354. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2354 and received in evidence.) 

.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The documents to which I refer are copies of defense documents 664, 5 and 6.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: They have already written across them exhibits "2351, 2352," and "2353," respectively.

CLERK OF THE COURT: It is your document 206E 11 that I refer to. We have no copies for the Bench.

MR. ROBERTS: While we are reading number 2351, we can have the Page obtain the other copies.

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt containing Mr. Grew's alleged statements of fact will have exhibit No. 2354. As yet we have no copies of that statement of fact by Mr. Grew.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall now read exhibit No. 2351.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you going to read the whole of these three speeches?

MR. ROBERTS: We would like to have them read into the transcript, if the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: Surely, there are only parts that might be read.

MR. ROBERTS: We did not wish to make any excerpts because of some misconstruction that might

be placed upon that. 1 MR. ROBERTS: (Reading) 2 "ADDRESS OF HIS : DYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE WAN 3 WAITHAYAKON, BI PRESENTATIVE OF THAILAND. 4 "November 1943 5 "Monsieur le President, Your Excellencies," --6 Mi. TAVENPER: If your Honor please, these 7 speeches contain thirty-two legal size pages. 8 THE PRESIDENT: We desire that they be not 9 read. We will not hear them. They are in evidence, 10 Mr. Roberts. 11 MR. ROBERTS: May I have the privilege of 12 deferring the reading of the entire documents and 13 read excerpts later on if we so desire? 14 THE PRESIDENT: It depends on the number and 15 16 the length of the excerpts. We will have no objection, 17 I am sure, to hearing those later, if necessary. 18 MR. ROBERTS: I shall now read exhibit No. 19 2354: 20 "'The New Order in East Asia! 21 "We ourselves can epitomize Japan's funda-22 mental desiderate perhaps better than many Japanese 23 can. They desire:" --24 THE PRISIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr. 25 MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I understood

6

that the Tribunal was going to look at this document to decide whether it contained statements of fact or not before permitting it to be read into the record.

opinion, and we are not going to let Mr. Grew take over our functions. The document is rejected.

MR. ROBERTS: I now offer in evidence defense document 502, excerpt 38.

THE PRESIDENT: This is also opinion, is it not? Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: This, as I read it, your Honor, is Sir Robert's opinion of other people's opinions.

MR. ROBERTS: We are, again, simply following the procedure followed by the prosecution.

followed in the case of Mr. Ballantine. On the application of the defense, we rejected Mr. Ballantine tine's opinion. So, on the application of the prosecution, we reject the opinions of Sir Robert Craigie and Mr. Grew.

The document is rejected; the objection upheld.

MR. ROBERTS: We now offer defense document
No. 128 for the purpose of showing the use of the

0

Ĭ

1

3

6

9

11

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

term "Greater East Asia" by Sun Yat-sen, father of the Chinese Revolution. This expresses the feeling of the Chinese people and Asiatics in general concerning a movement to consolidate the peoples of East Asia before the adoption of the idea by Japan fourteen years later.

MR. TAVENTER: If it please your Honor, this is a speech made by Sun Yat-sen, a private citizen of China, at the Kobe Girls' School in behalf of the local Chamber of Commerce and other organizations. It was delivered in 1924. It relates to conditions alleged to have existed thirty years prior thereto. It refers to public opinion in Europe as the speaker observed it at the time of the Russo-Japanese War. It refers to independence movements in Egypt, Persia, Turkey, Afghanistan and Arabia. It comments upon a book published by an unnamed American scholar on the rise of the colored race.

THE PRESIDENT: You are going to put all of it into the transcript, obviously, Mr. Tavenner. I think we have heard enough. Merely as Dr. Sun Yatsen's opinion it must be rejected. It may show the origin. The origin of Greater Fast Asia is rather remote. What we want to know is what it meant during the relevant period. We must place some limit on

de

these inquiries.

M. ROBERTS: The prosecution has contended that the phrase "A New Order in East Asia" was something that was very sinister; that these defendants were part of a common plan or conspiracy to promote such a new order for their own progressive purposes. We want to show --

THE PRESIDENT: It is the use that is put to these things that matter. The ideals may be innocent enough. It is the way they are used by others.

MR. MOBERTS: But the manner of the prosecution in referring to this phrase has been that it has been an idea of the accused that they used for aggressive purposes. We want to show that it was not even originated only by the Japanese people.

THE PHESIDENT: Its origin and its former meaning are too remote, too immaterial. The only thing that matters is what it means today or what it meant in the case of the accused and what purpose they were putting it to.

As a Member of the Tribunal puts it, the Court is concerned with actions and conduct, not the words with which they were referred to. The objection is upheld. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

h a 10 C 11 12

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

THE PRESIDENT: Where is the missing witness? R. ROBERTS: He has arrived.

However, with reference to the last document that we were discussing at the time of recess, I wanted to point out one additional fact.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we have rejected that, Pr. Roberts.

IR. ROBERTS: It was my thought that if the Court was informed that there are certain facts pointed out in this document which led to the feeling of the people of Asia that a common bond was necessary--

THE PRESIDENT: No, our ruling has been given. We will hear no further debate about it.

IR. ROBERTS: We recall the witness YAMANOTO.

19 20

> 21 22

23

24

KUMAICHI YAMAMOTO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: You are still on oath, Witness.

Will you please explain why you weren't here
at half-past nine?

THE WITNESS: Last Friday before I left this court I had made arrangements with the Witnesses Section in this Tribunal to have a car sent to my home at eight-thirty this morning and I was waiting for the arrival of that car. The person in charge of transportation did not send the car around until ten o'clock this morning; hence, I became late in arriving here.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that explanation is accepted. Now we will get in touch with the person in charge of transportation, because we must fix responsibility in these matters. We are not going to pass over them lightly.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR, COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Mr. YAMAMOTO, you told us in your direct examination that in 1940 you were head of the Asia

1 Bur 2 3 4 of 5 Gov 6 Sph 7 exh 8 Tha 9 sub 10 11 in 12 13 Co-14 15 Chi 16

Bureau of the Foreign Ministry, is that right?

A Yes, I was.

Q And you told us about the public declaration of the government at that time, the second KONOYE Government, about the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. I am now going to refer to prosecution exhibit 628, which is prosecution accument No. 837-A. That is a series of secret declarations on the same subject at the same time, found in the Foreign Ministry.

Reading from page 2, the paragraph numbered in Roman figures IV:

"Establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

"(1) In the regions including French Indo-China, Lutch East Indies, Strait Settlements, British Malaya, Thailand, the Philippine Islands, British Borneo and Burma, with Japan, Manchukuo and China as center, we should construct a sphere in which politics, economy and culture of those countries and regions are combined."

Was that the real policy of the government on the 28th of September 1940?

A Before replying, may I inquire under whose name and where this document was made?

Q I have already informed you that it comes from

23 24

17

18

19

20

21

22

the archives of the Foreign Office, and it is headed 1 "Very Secret. Outline of Japanese Foreign Policy, 2 28 September 1940." 3 MR. ROBERTS: May I respectfully request that 5 the witness be shown the original document that is 6 being referred to? THE PRESIDENT: He hasn't asked for it, but if 8 he wants it he may see it. I don't suppose the English translation is questioned? 10 MR. ROBERTS: It is very vague on its face 11 and doesn't seem to have any certificate attached that 12 I can see. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, there is. There is a 14 certificate signed by SATO, Assistant Chief, Archives 15 Section. 16 Loes he want to see the original? If he does, 17 let him see it. It is so much waste of time if he 18 doesn't. And don't prompt him, Fr. Roberts. 19 THE WITNESS: I should like to see the original, 20 sir. 21 THE PRESIDENT: So much time wasted. 22 (Whereupon, a document was handed to 23 the witness.) 24

A By glance at this document, it is not clear

whether this document is simply an outline of Japanese

foreign policy proposed by the Foreign Office and adopted as a plan proposed by the Foreign Office, or a draft formulated by a secretary in the Foreign Office.

I cannot testify that this was the foreign policy of the Foreign Office simply on the basis of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not asked to do that.

Q It was in your department of the Foreign Office, wasn't it, that this document would be prepared?

A Yes.

\*\*

 Q Now, turn on, page 4 in the English copy, the part headed "Very Secret Tentative Plan for Policy towards the Southern Regions October 4, 1940." Was that also prepared in your department?

A At that time there was in the Foreign Office a South Seas Bureau which is outside the jurisdiction of my East Asia Bureau. I know nothing about this.

Q Let me just read some of it and see if you recognize it as the policy then under consideration in the Foreign Office:

"Although the objective of Japan's penetration into the Southern regions cover, in its first stage, the whole area to the west of Hawaii excluding for the time being the Philippines and Guam; French Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, British Burma and the Strait Settlements are the areas where we should first control. Then, we should gradually advance into the other areas. However, depending upon the attitude of the United States Government, the Philippines and Guam will be included.

- "(1) French Indo-China.
- "(a) We should maneuver an uprising of an independence movement, and should cause France to renounce its sovereign right. Should we manage to reach an understanding with Chiang Kai-Shek, the

7

11

10

13

12

15

..16 17

18

20

19

22

. 23

21

24 25

Tongking area will be managed by his troops, if military power is needed. However, Japanese military advisers should be appointed to the positions which cannot be ignored by the operations section. According to circumstances, we should let the army of Thailand manage the area of Cambodia.

"(b) The foregoing measures must be executed immediately after a truce has been concluded with Chiang Kai-Shek. If we do not succeed in our move with Chiang Kai-Shek, these measures should be carried out upon the accomplishment of the adjustment of the battle line in China. However, in case the German military operations to land on the British mainland, which is to be mentioned later, takes place, it may be necessary to carry out our move towards French Indo-China and Thailand regardless of our plans for Chiang Kai-Shek. (This is to be decided according to the liaison with Germany.)"

Now, leaving out the next two paragraphs and going to Paragraph 2, British Burma:

"(a) In case our plans in regard to Chiang Kai-Shek are achieved, we should immediately cause an independence movement to rise. And under the pretext of supporting the movement, we should make Chiang's army march into the said area under the secret

assistance of the Japanese army, and make Burma detrch from British sovereignty.

"(b) In case our move in regard to Chiang
Kai-Shek fails, we should make an independence movement
start after we establish real Japanese power in the
Singapore area, and thus make Burma detach from
British sovereignty."

That latter is exactly what you did, isn't it, Mr. YAMAMOTO?

A By studying the contents of the document just read I can say that this document of itself was not a document which determined the Foreign Office's foreign policy; rather that it was a draft plan formulated by a junior secretary in the Foreign Office for experimental or study purposes within the Foreign Office.

Q The junior secretary was a very good prophet, wasn't he?

MR. ROBERTS: I object to that as highly improper, if the Court please, simply an opinion called for.

THE PRESIDENT: The real objection is that it is argumentative. Mr. Comyns Carr is really addressing us now. This man has disclaimed any knowledge of this particular section of the Foreign

Office. However, we have admitted this type of crossexamination. The objection is overruled.

Q Would you answer the question?

A The members of the staff of the Foreign Office have made far-reaching studies regarding world peace, and have a wide knowledge of international and world affairs. If you, Mr. Prosecutor, say that this secretary was a good prophet from the results, I would say rather that these secretaries were very good students.

Spratt & Yelden

1

3

6

7

Q Now, would you answer my previous question which you tidn't answer. Wasn't the statement made in that paragraph 2(b) exactly what happened?

A I think that in some respects they were realized and some they were not.

Q Were not these independent movements that you have been talking about in Burma and elsewhere movements which in the words of this document, "Japan made to start"?

A No, they are not movements which Japan made and started.

Q Now a few questions with regard to French.

Indo-China. Why was not French Indo-China represented at the conference you have told us about?

A As I have frequently stated before, the assembly of the Greater East Asiatic nations was held amongst representatives of independent nations in Greater East Asia. French Indo-China is a colony of France, and from that standpoint French-Indo-China was not represented at this assembly -- was not invited to this assembly.

Q But French Indo-China was part of the coprosperity sphere within the jurisdiction of your ministry, wasn't it?

A It was our policy to create a co-prosperous

9

12

11

14

13

16

15

17

18 19

20

22

24

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

order in areas adjacent to and neighboring Japan by mutual respect of their sovereignty, and it was our hope that this order of co-prosperity will spread and include French Indo-China. Of course the desire -the ardent desire and wish to share in that co-prosperity was not limited only to French Indo-China but other areas which were occupied by the Japanese Army. However, the assembly itself was limited to the independent nations of the Greater East Asia area.

Independent of whom?

Independent as applied to other nations in the world.

THE PRESIDENT: They may be independent of Britain, but what about Japan?

Of course.

Now, I will go back and ask you to answer the question you didn't answer before the last one.

Was not French Indo-China included in the Greater East Asia Sphere under the jurisdiction of your ministry?

After the establishment of the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs, affairs relating to French Indo-China came under the ministry's jurisdiction. However, as I have stated before, matters relating to pure diplomacy were under the

24

jurisdiction of the Foreign Ministry.

Q Now, as you have mentioned that again
I will ask you a question about it. If these
countries were really independent of Japan as you
say, what was the need to have a separate ministry
to deal with them at all?

A I think you would understand if I should explain the purpose why the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs was established. The Greater East Asiatic Affairs Ministry was established on the idea to unify and coordinate the relationship between Japan and the various nations in the Greater East Asia Sphere because of the fact that the handling of affairs with respect -- the handling of affairs between Japan and these East Asiatic nations was so complicated and so out of order and so irregular, and this ministry was established on the basis that pure diplomacy would be handled by the Foreign Office of Japan vis-a-vis the independent nations of the sphere.

Q Do you know that the matter was fully discussed before the ministry was set up in the Privy Council?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q And did you study what was said there?
- A Yes, of course.

Q I now refer to exhibit 687, which is the record of those proceedings; first of all, on page 5, document 1086. On page 5 of the English translation there is a paragraph numbered "5" at the bottom.

"He," that is, Committee Member USHIO,

"inquired as to the scope of the Greater East Asia
Sphere. Prime Minister TOJO replied that it will
include the Kwantung Province, South Sea Island
Group, Manchuria, China, Siam, French Indo-China,
and the newly occupied areas brought about by the
Greater East Asia War."

Now, you told me on Friday that your ministry didn't handle matters connected with the occupied areas unless they had been granted independence. Was that true?

A Yes, it had no connection with such areas.

I should like to know definitely, Mr. Prosecutor, whether the passage you just quoted referred to the Greater East Asia as an area or Greater East Asia area under the jurisdiction of the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs.

It clearly refers to both, but to make it -put it beyond doubt I will refer you to another document. That is exhibit 90, prosecution document 213, Imperial Ordinance No. 707, which actually established your ministry. I will read Article 19 on page 6: "To extend cooperation to the Army and the Navy, the Ministry of Greater East Asiatic Affairs shall conduct affairs concerning administration of the occupied areas within the Greater East Asia area." So what you told me on Friday was not true, was it?

A What I said on Friday remains true. What I should like to point out with respect to the passage just quoted is that -- is the point that the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs will extend cooperation to the army and navy and this is to be taken in the same sense as the other ministries will cooperate with the Foreign Office in its handling of diplomatic affairs with other countries. Addition: that is cooperate with the army and navy in respect of occupied areas.

Mr. YAMAMOTO, have you forgotten the words. "The Ministry of Greater East Asiatic Affairs shall conduct affairs concerning administration of the occupied areas"?

11

13 14

12

2

3

6

7

9

10

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

Now, reverting to exhibit 687, document 1086, on page 7 there is a passage which deals with what you told us about diplomacy. This is a question by Committee Member OBATA:

"The nations of the world will be divided into two groups; of which the state affairs of one group will be handled not by the Foreign Office but by the Greater East Asia Ministry. The question was asked whether there would not be consternation that the countries under this category would treat Japan as a colonization ministry." and

"Foreign Minister TANI replied that Japan has special diplomatic relations with the various independent countries in the Greater East Asia Sphere. Since internal guidance of their diplomacy is also being conducted, there is no need of apprehension. It is similar to the special agreement existing between French Indo-China and France. Since France respects the intentions of Japan regarding French Indo-China, actually it is impossible to believe that French Indo-China will deal with Japan as a colonization ministry. On the part of Japan, the French ambassador has conferred with the Foreign Minister concerning the local problems of French Indo-China, but no objections were made."

Who conducted the internal guidance of the diplomacy of these countries which you call independent?

A The words, "internal guidance," are words which to this day I am unable to understand. However, I believe as follows with respect to the meaning as pointed out in the passage just quoted, that is, for example, in the case of Japan-Manchukuo relations the Manchukuo cooperated and consulted Japan on matters of diplomacy in accordance with treaty provisions, and I believe that what is referred there is that Japan conducted diplomacy, the internal guidance of diplomacy, on the basis of treaty provisions — that if in accordance with treaty provisions Manchukuo should consult with Japan on diplomatic affairs, Japan would be ready to give her advice.

Q The matter is further explained at the top of page 13. I want to see what you say about that. (Reading):

"Committee member FUTAGANI states: (1) The overseas organs of the Greater East Asia Ministry are officially under the command of the Foreign Minister concerning matters of customary diplomacy; and under the command of the Greater East Asia Minister on those of extranormal diplomacy. Furthermore, since the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

distinction between customary and extranormal diplomacy is not clear, they /overseas organs/ receive orders separately rom the both ministers of the central government on the same issue. He asked whether or not there is fear of this giving cause to bewilderment so that they would not be able to act properly. Foreign Minister TAMI replied that the relations of our Empire with the countries in the Greater East Asia sphere are somewhat the relations between relatives and it is the ideal of our Empire to have this further strengthened and developed into the relations of a single large family, and that during this period it could be eventually led to a point where diplomacy would not be needed any more. But at the present stage, due to need for respect of dignity and the exchange of documents, it is necessary that customary diplomacy be continued. Within this extent will the overseas organs come under the superintendence of the Foreign Minister."

Mr. YAMAMOTO, if these countries were really independent, why should either of these two ministries interfere with their diplomacy?

A Speaking frankly, I was one of those who were fundamentally opposed to the establishment of the Greater East Asia Ministry. As stated therein,

there is a great deal of anxiety and fear lest with establishment of such a ministry would create various uncertainties and doubts; and therefore at the time I was one of those who were strongly in favor of -correction: at that time in handling the affairs, diplomatic affairs of Japan, vis-a-vis other countries, although we were in favor of the idea of unifying and coordinating the handling of affairs relating to other countries, still we strongly contended that the actual carrying out of diplomacy should at all costs be left in the hands of the Foreign Office. THE PRESIDENT: Do you want an answer to your question before lunch? You have not got one. MR. COMYNS CARR: No, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

19

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

0

20

21

22 23

24

## AFTERNOON SESSION

Kapleau

11 12 13

10

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

MARSHAL CF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MAJOR MOORE (LANGUAGE ARBITER): Mr. President, with the Tribunal's permission we submit the following language correction:

Record page 17,988, lines 9 to 13, delete from "for the" to the end of the paragraph and substitute "as I maintained, not to grant independence for such reasons was an argument which I could not accept."

This correction covers record page 17, 989, lines 20 to 25 and record page 17,990, lines 3 to 6.

THE PRESIDENT: There will be no mid-afternoon recess. Instead we will adjourn at 3:15 P. M. to enable members of the staff to change old currency into new.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

10 11 12

Kapleau

15 16

17

18

13

14

19 20

22 23

21

25

24

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

MARSHAL CF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MAJOR MOORE (LANGUAGE ARBITER): Mr. President, with the Tribunal's permission we submit the following language correction:

Record page 17,988, lines 9 to 13, delete from "for the" to the end of the paragraph and substitute "as I maintained, not to grant independence for such reasons was an argument which I could not accept."

This correction covers record page 17, 989, lines 20 to 25 and record page 17,990, lines 3 to 6.

THE PRESIDENT: There will be no mid-afternoon recess. Instead we will adjourn at 3:15 P. M. to enable members of the staff to change old currency into new.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

KUMAICHI Y A M A M O T O, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COMYN'S CARR (Continued): 7 Would the Court Reporter kindly read my 8 last question before the adjournment? 9 (Whereupon, the official court reporter 10 read as follows:) 11 "Q Mr. YAMAMOTO, if these countries were really 12 independent, why should either of these two ministries 13 interfere with their diplomacy?" 14 You have just said about interference by two ministries in diplomacy; but even after the 16 establishment of the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs, customary diplomacy was in the 18 hands of the Foreign Ministry. MR. COMYNS CARR: That still is not an 20 answer, but I won't trouble about it. Turning now to page 19 of the statement, exhibit 687, the third paragraph:

"Committee Chief SUZUKI,"-that is not the

accused but Kantaro SUZUKI -- "stated to the effect

that this draft is not based upon the rules of right

15

17

19

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

but on the rules of might." THE MONITOR: Mr. Comyns Carr, will you give us a moment to find the corresponding version on the Japanese text, please? MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, last page of the Meeting of the 20th of October. Do I understand that you agreed with that? May I ask again, are you referring to the fact that it was the words of Committee Chairman SUZUKI with respect to the rules of righteousness and the rules of might? Those were his words, and I am asking you whether you agreed with them. I do not think it is a policy that intentionally strayed away from the rule of righteousness into the rule of might. But you told me this morning that you were opposed to the formation of this ministry? A Yes, I said so. At that time I was not opposed to the purpose but contended that a separate organ should not be created for that purpose.

THE MONITOR: Aside from the Foreign Ministry.

Q Then why did you immediately accept the position of Vice-Minister?

A At that time the Foreign Minister and his

24

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

staff were unanimously opposed to the establishment of the new ministry and as a result both the minister, Mr. TOGO, and the Vice-Minister, Mr. NISHI, took responsibility and resigned from their positions, as I am sure you know, because unfortunately the plan was adopted by the government. I accepted the post of Vice-Minister of the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs for the following reason: At the time the problem arose with respect to the establishment of the new Ministry, I was Director of the East Asia Bureau of the Foreign Office. Despite the fact that I was one of those opposed to the establishment of the Ministry, the plan for the establishment of said Ministry was nevertheless adopted and I, as a Secretary, gave deep consideration to whether it was necessary for me to resign in prosecuting or carrying out the ideas which we entertained and whether it would have any effect on the application of the ideas which we entertained. Those who were responsible as head of our Foreign Office resigned; but we who were their subordinates determined to stay on because we believed it to be the true way of government officials to carry out our desires, intentions and ideas by getting into the Ministry -new Ministry and operate it in accordance with our ideas.

.

19

21

22

23

24

Q Now coming back to French Indo-China, did that country get any co-prosperity?

A Japan made every effort to bring about co-prosperity within the limits of its possibility under the circumstances at that time.

Q Isn't it the truth that Japan deliberately bled French Indo-China white?

A There is no such fact.

Q I will only ask you about one matter by way of illustration of that.

Was the original arrangement in the agreement of May 6, 1941, which is exhibit 658, that the balance, whichever way it was, of imports and exports between the two countries should be settled every month in gold or foreign currencies convertible into gold?

A May I inquire the nature of the document to which you just referred? May I state that at that time I was Director of the East Asia Bureau and the Bureau which was in charge -- which had charge of matters relating to French Indo-China was the South Seas Bureau.

Q Didn't you, as Vice-Minister of the Greater
East Asia Ministry, take the trouble to look at the
agreements by which you were bound and which you
were supposed to be carrying out?

A The Ministry for Greater East Asiatic

Affairs was established in November, 1942, and it
is a fact that I made a study and review of important
events and documents before that time.

Q Well, do not you know that the agreement
I have spoken of, of May 16, 1941 between Japan
and French Indo-China, provided that these balances
should be settled in gold or foreign currencies
convertible into gold?

Clause 24 for the information of the Tribunal.

A I now recall.

Q Did not Japan demand such a large volume of goods to be sent from French Indo-China to Japan that there was always an enormous balance in favor of French Indo-China in money?

A Although some of your explanation is not entirely clear to me, it is a fact that at that time there were very intimate trade relations existing between Japan and French Indo-China; and our country Japan did every effort possible -- made every effort possible to promote very close trade relations with French Indo-China in connection with the China Incident by sending goods in which they were lacking and vice versa. As for French Indo-China, the obtaining of a favorable balance in trade by sending out all

exportable products was not inimical to French Indo-Chinese economy and finance.

Q Did Japan ever pay those balances?

A I believe that the settlements were made.

after you took office and your ministry was established, Japan compelled French Indo-China to change that agreement so that instead of being paid in gold or convertible currencies they should be paid in special yen blocked in the Yokahama Specie Bank?

MR. ROBERTS: I object to the form of the question and the characterization that Japan had compelled French Indo-China to carry on these acts.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there is nothing much wrong with the form of the question. I think you are only juggling with words, Mr. Roberts, really. There is nothing really objectionable in the form and certainly nothing wrong in the substance. The objection is overruled.

A The words have just been used that the special yer system was compelled or forced upon French Indo-China, but this arrangement was made in peacetime in accordance with agreement -- in accordance with an agreement between the two parties.

Q Do you suggest that French Indo-China

3

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16 17

18

19

21

22 23

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

occupation expenses also.

voluntarily accepted that agreement? A Of course, Japan did not force anything upon them. Wasn't the effect of it anyway that French Indo-China was never paid at all? A Whether the settlements were actually made at that time is a separate question; but it is a fact that Japan was bound by her obligations of the arrangement established between the two countries and that Japan carried out the provisions of the arrangement. Did not even that arrangement contain a clause that they should convert them into gold? There are certain points that I do not recall at present with regard to specific items in the arrangement. Now did not exactly the same thing apply to the payments for the Japanese occupation force? Japan only acted in accordance with the arrangement with French Indo-China in regard to

22

24

r 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Did not Joon originally undertake to repry them in gold and later refuse to pay them except in blocked yen?

THE PRESIDENT: It would be wise to rvoid that phraseology, Mr. Comyns Carr. I suppose all that happened was a fresh agreement was made, and you invite us to assume it was made under compulsion because no nation with its wits about it would recept paper for gold.

" Mh. COMYAS CAMA: Yes, your Honor, and there is more direct evidence of the compulsion then that already before the iribunal but I did not propose to rsk this witness rbout that.

But now a matter of compulsion which was not by agreement, Mr. YA.ALOIO. After your ministry come into being was not the Bank of French Indo-Chine compelled by the occupation authorities to print and hand over enormous quantities of notes -h nd over to the occupation authorities enormous quantities of notes without any backing at all?

Is your question, ar. Prosecutor, to the effect that the Ministry for Greater East Asiatio Affairs crused such a step to be taken?

- O First of all, do you know it was taken?
- As I have frequently said before, after

23 24

the establishment of the Ministry for Greater

East Asiatic Affairs, all acts -- all actions were

taken in accordance with the principle of Greater

East Asia Co-Prosperity and that any mistakes were

rectified and that in the handling of all matters

the principle of Greater East Asian Co-prosperity

was carried out in that high, strong conviction.

Insumuch as after the establishment of the Ministry

we were in the midst of a very large-scale war

there may have been specific instances which did not

accord -- which were not in accord with the principle

of co-prosperity. With regard to the point which

you have just indicated, I do not have any positive

recollection.

Q Well, then, why could you not have said so instead of making that speech. Do you know that in the last year of Japanese occupation of French Indo-Chine -- the demands upon that country for so-called expenses of occupation troops were more than fifteen times as great as in the first year?

have hesitated to bring this up but I think my friend should be instructed not to make these side remarks which are solely for the Court's ear and not for the benefit of the witness.

4 5

THE PRESIDENT: It depends upon the witness. This witness is far from frank. He has avoided answering questions. He has gone a round about way to answer them and cross-examining counsel is well within his rights in reminding him.

- Q Now I will repert the question which was interrupted: Do you know that in the last year of Japanese occupation of French Indo-China the amounts demanded in the name of expenses of the Japanese army were more than fifteen times as great as in the first year?
- A Inasmuch as I was in Thailand at that time I do not know anything about the last year of occupation in French Indo-China -- the last year of relations with French Indo-China.
- Q Did Japan carry out in I rench Indo-China exactly the same policy as I have asked you about with regard to other countries, namely, confiscating all the principal business to whomsoever they belonged and handing them over to Japanese companies?

Mh. MOBERTS: We submit, if the Court please, this is too broad a generalization because we know there is no evidence to support that.

THE FRESIDERT: He may supply the evidence.

I think the question is permissible. Objection

overruled.

A With regard to French Indo-China also all matters were handled by the Ministry for Greater East Asiatic Affairs after its establishment in accordance with its policy.

If it his age in Principle

MA. COMYNS CARR: That will be all.

THE PRESIDENT: Apparently there will be no re-examination.

DR. KIYOSE: Mr. hoberts conducted the examination in chief but inasmuch as there are so many matters related with the defendant TOJO am

I allowed to re-examine this witness?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts is not going to re-examine, I understand. You are going to do so if you are allowed. Is that the intention:

Dh. KIYOSE: If I am permitted, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I understand my colleagues went Mr. Roberts to do it nevertheless so Mr. Roberts must do the re-examination and you may put questions through him, Dr. KIYOSE.

Historia de en la la la de consumero, tem de ten disperso.

3

5

7

9

11

12

14

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

MR. ROBERTS: If it please the Tribunal, we submit that much of the cross-examination was on matters which were not touched in the original examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you knew when you called him that he was the man who went abroad with the accused TOJO, and, in those circumstances, it might have been arranged for Dr. KIYOSE to examine him in chief. But if the principal part of the examination was left to you, Mr. Roberts, why shouldn't the minor part? Nothing has happened to affect your competence. Dr. KIYOSE doesn't intend to cross-examine, but only to re-examine. He said so. You can do that.

MR. ROBERTS: The redirect, as I stated, will be principally upon the matters brought out which we stated in our belief were outside the scope of the examination and affect, in chief, Mr. TOJO.

THE PRESIDENT: We have given our ruling, but let me make it clear that your beliefs, being erroneous, do not affect the position. The cross-examination was within the scope of the re-examination, was within the scope of the examination in chief. We have given our decision. We will hear no further argument. If Mr. Roberts doesn't want to re-examine, then the witness will be excused.

The witness is released on the usual terms.

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

MR. ROBERTS: If it please the Tribunal, we submit that much of the cross-examination was on matters which were not touched in the original examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you knew when you called him that he was the man who went abroad with the accused TOJO, and, in those circumstances, it might have been arranged for Dr. KIYOSE to examine him in chief. But if the principal part of the examination was left to you, Mr. Roberts, why shouldn't the minor part? Nothing has happened to affect your competence. Dr. KIYOSE doesn't intend to cross-examine, but only to re-examine. He said so. You can do that.

MR. ROBERTS: The redirect, as I stated, will be principally upon the matters brought out which we stated in our belief were outside the scope of the examination and affect, in chief, Mr. TOJO.

THE PRESIDENT: We have given our ruling, but let me make it clear that your beliefs, being erroneous, do not affect the position. The cross-examination was within the scope of the re-examination, was within the scepe of the examination in chief. We have given our decision. We will hear no further argument. If Mr. Roberts doesn't want to re-examine, then the witness will be excused.

The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

DR. KIYOSE: May I cross-examine, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: You have changed your mind to meet the situation. We are not going to allow you to do that. You told me clearly you wanted to re-examine and nothing has caused you to change your mind except an adverse decision of the Court.

MR. ROBERTS: May we have the witness recalled to the stand please.

THE PRESIDENT: This looks like defiance and we won't tolerate it. The Tribunal is in charge of this Court and will remain so.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to state to the Court that I did not desire to proceed with redirect, because, frankly, I was not familiar with all the facts brought out on cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: We have given our decision.

You must respect it. We will hear no further argument
on this matter. Proceed with your other evidence.

MR. ROBERTS: I am able to conduct some of the redirect if your Honors would be so kind as to permit it at this time. I did not understand the witness was being excused.

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed with your other evidence.

MR. LOGAN: With all due respect to the Tribunal's

1 2

3

5

7

8

,

10

11

13

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

ruling, it was our intention to have Dr. KIYOSE

conduct this re-examination and if he didn't get the

permission of the Tribunal to do so, that we intended

to have Mr. Roberts do it as far as he could humanly

possibly do it, and we think this witness is of sufficient

importance that he should be examined on redirect. We

have not --

THE PRESIDENT: To us, Mr. Logan, it looked like defiance and we were prepared to meet it and always will be.

MR. LOGAN: I can assure your Honor there is no intention to have any defiance whatsoever. The prosecution and the defense have been working on this very problem and we expect to have something to submit to the Tribunal shortly with respect to the order of examinations. It hasn't been completed yet, but we expect it today, but in the meantime we have been trying to work this so as few defense attorneys would examine as possible to conduct the defense in an expeditious manner.

In this phase Mr. Roberts, who conducted the direct examination, represented OKA and in the cross-examination many matters came out with respect to TOJO and under the Charter each accused is entitled to examine a witness; and for these reasons I would like to ask

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your Honor to review the ruling which you have just made.

THE PRESIDENT: The ruling was the ruling of the majority of the Tribunal. I was in a minority in the first place.

The majority of the Tribunal desire to hear you or to hear Mr. Roberts re-examine.

(Whereupon. Mr. Roberts approached the lectern.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear from Mr. Roberts.

It is my duty to support the ruling of the

Tribunal whatever I think and I do so.

KUHAICHI YAMAMOTO, called as a
witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the
stand and testified through Japanese interpreters
as follows:

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. ROBERTS:

Q When you said on cross-examination on Friday,
Mr. YAMAMOTO, when you were questioned concerning certain
acts that had occurred in the Philippines, that you did
not recall small details will you tell us what you
meant by this expression?

A When I used the term "small details", I meant

.

2

10

11

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Q	Wit	h respect	t to	Mr.	Ba-Mo,	do	you	know	what
position	he d	occupied	in	Burma	before	tl	ne wa	ar?	nilvi

A My understanding is that Dr. Ba-Mo was the chief of some kind of a proletarian party, whose name I do not recall, in Burma; and I also recall that he was at one time a sort of Prime Minister of the Government of Burma under British rule.

You were also asked a question concerning the indictment of one of the members who attended that conference. Can you tell us if, in your knowledge, any of the other representatives who attended the Greater East Asia Conference in 1944 have been indicted or convicted for war crimes?

A Are you referring to representatives to the Assembly of Greater East Asiatic Nations aside from the Japanese representatives?

Q Yes.

A I think that, for instance, Dr. Laurel of the Philippines and Dr. Chu Min-Yi of China were indicted.

Q Have you knowledge with respect to the other representatives?

A Yes. About Dr. Ba-Mo I have heard that he had been under investigation by the British authorities but that recently he had been released.

Q Do you know what position Prince Wan-wai of

Thailand occupies today?

A Around June last year, when I left Thailand,
I think Prince Wan-wai Thayakon was the Postal Adviser
to the Cabinet. I have been informed, although I do
not know whether it is correct, that recently Prince
Wan-wai Thayakon was appointed Ambassador to the
United States.

Q What was the new policy toward China formulated since you were made Vice-Minister of Greater East Asia Ministry?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I do not recollect asking any question which would raise this matter in redirect.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you raised the attitude of Japan towards China. You dealt with that, I understand. I think you did. I cannot remember you mentioning China specifically, nevertheless.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I did mention China specifically for the purpose of showing that the government
to which the witness referred was not independent, and
I used the document of 1941 for that purpose. But
what he is now being asked about is a new policy
introduced by the Greater East Asia Ministry, and that
was not introduced either in direct or in crossexamination.

10

11

13

14

16

17

19 20

18

21

\_\_

24

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if it bears on independence, it is admissible. I do not know what the point of it is at all.

What is the new policy? You have an obligation to employ clear terms, Mr. Roberts, so we will know whether or not it is within the scope of reexamination.

MR. ROBERTS: They did refer to the policy towards China. We wanted to show the recommendation made by this witness at the time he left the Ministry towards that policy.

THE PRESIDENT: He was brought here to testify on Japan's attitude, and not on his opinions; and this reexamination goes to his opinions. The objection is upheld.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not refer to an opinion, if the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: A recommendation is the same thing.

MR. ROBERTS: This was a recommendation that I refer to while he was still Vice-Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: A recommendation and opinion are the same thing in circumstances. A recommendation embodies his opinion of what ought to be done.

BY MR. ROBERTS (Continued):

Q I asked you previously if any of the men who attended the conference were indicted for war crimes, and I now ask you if any of the men who attended the conference have been indicted or convicted by their own people for alleged collaboration with Japan.

A In my recollection, I do not think there are any of the delegates who were represented at the conference who were indicted or charged by their own people for having cooperated with Japan. The representative from Thailand was Prince Wan-wai Thayakon, but Prince Wan-wai came as a representative of the Prime Minister of Thailand. The Prime Minister of Thailand at that time was Field Marshal Pibul; and since the end of the war Field Marshal Pibul was arrested and imprisoned, but later it was found that this decision was unconstitutional, and he was freed.

Q Do you recall the position occupied by Mr. Chandra Bose?

A If I get your question rightly, he was represented at the Assembly of Greater East Asiatic Nations on behalf of the Provisional Government of Free India. Before that he was a revolutionary leader in India, and the information that I received was that he was twice President of the Indian National Congress.

4 5

on Friday the prosecutor referred to a document marked exhibit No. 1332 and stated it was a reported decision of the cabinet meeting. I refer y.u again to this document which is marked "Report" on the certificate filed with the document, and ask you if you had known that this was a report of the Pinistry of Commerce would you have answered in the same manner that you did?

NR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I must object to that -- to the statement contained in that question. It is incorrect. The document shows it is, as I stated, a cabinet meeting report, and that it was sent as a top secret document to the chief official of the Commerce and Industry Ministry.

MR. ROBERTS: May I then withdraw the question and ask that the witness be permitted to see the original document?

THE PRESIDENT: Let him see the original if he wishes to see it.

O Mr. YAMAMOTO, will you examine that document and tell us what it is?

A when the contents of this document were referred to me the last time I said that I had no accurate knowledge of the matter. Now as I see this document I can say that this is not a decision of

3

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

24

the Liaison Conference between the Japanese government and the Imperial General Headquarters, but a report prepared by the Sixth Committee, which is -- which was a part of the planning board and a group composing a committee with representatives from the various ministries concerned, with the object principally to make a study of economic problems, and this is nothing more than a document which reported the conclusions of the Sixth Committee to the Liaison Conference and the cabinet.

O Then it is not a decision of the cabinet. Is that correct?

A I do not think it is a decision.

on page 1, paragraph I again. "The principal aim of the policy is to fill the demand for important natural resources and thereby contribute to the execution of the present warfare, and at the same time, to establish a system of autorchy for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, and speedily find means of strengthening and repleting the Imperial economic strength."

Now you answered to that, when you were told that it was a cabinet decision, as follows: I have no positive recollection, but I presume that there

7 8

2

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

was such a decision.

Do you now wish to change your answer in respect to the information you have just received?

In the last time when I was asked this question I replied that such an opinion also -- such a decision may also have been made. After looking at this document I should like to make my reply as follows: Although this is not a cabinet decision it can be said as a fact that such ideas were entertained by some officials within the government, that is to say with respect to the passage just quoted.

O The prosecution has called to your attention certain acts which occurred in the Philippines during the war. With respect to these acts what was the purpose of the conference in 1943?

A "ith regard to Japanese acts in the Philippines -- acts in the Philippines referred to by the prosecution, both in time and in breadth these acts were committed before the ideal of -- of establishing a co-prosperity sphere in greater East Asia crystallized. The measures taken by Japan following the occupation of these territories since the outbreak of the war were not all necessarily satisfactory. Gradually through Japanese self-reflection and on

the basis of experience gained, improvements were made and the former acts rectified. And in such a manner the idea of convening an assembly of greater Tast Asiatic nations took concrete form after the ideals developed and matured that a greater East Asian co-prosperity sphere must be established incorporating the spirit and wishes of the various peoples living in this sphere.

O Did that conference take up and discuss some of the problems referred to?

A The prosecution pointed out -- largely pointed out -- referred to -- economic problems.

With respect to the economic problem I think it was the third article of the joint declaration which sets the course for economic development in the future.

I refer now to exhibit No. 687, prosecution document 1086. In answer to certain questions propounded by the prosecutor based on this document you stated that the occupied areas were excluded from your authority. I now read from page 5, in paragraph marked (2), beginning with the words "In reply."

"In reply to his query made to the views of the Government authorities, Prime Minister TOJO stated that the Southern Occupied Areas are now under

•

military administration and, therefore, the authority of the Greater East Asia Ministry is excluded." Is that in accordance with the statement made by you when you were questioned by the prose-cutor? A Yes. High along the concepts and the terror which although 

Whalen & Duda

Q I now refer to page 21 of the same exhibit,
second paragraph, beginning with the word "chief."
I refer to this article for the purpose of clarifying
the meaning of Article XIX of exhibit 90. I read:

"Chief of the Legislative Bureau, MOhIYAMA, explained that the administration of the occupied territories in the south is at present conducted according to the prerogative of the Supreme Command, and, therefore, lies beyond the scope of the Greater East Asia Ministry."

Is that also in accordance with the answers given by you this morning?

A Yes, my reply is consistent with this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: My friend shouldn't stop

in the middle of a paragraph. He should read the

next sentence which shows the meaning.

MR. ROBERTS: Anything that the prosecutor desires to read, he may do so.

Mk. COMYNS CARR: If my friend wishes to mislead the Tribunal by reading only a portion of what he says is an explanation I cannot help it. I shall have to ask leave to read the rest later.

MR. ROBERTS: If the Court please, I object to these tactics on the part of the prosecutor, and ask that he be instructed not to continue them.

THE PRESIDENT: I think it was a serious objection. But do cut out this by-play.

MR. ROBERTS: In view of what the prosecutor says I would be willing to read the rest of the paragraph, but I am trying to save the time of the Court, as requested.

THE PRESIDENT: Had you immediately read it when the objection was raised you would have saved time, certainly.

Well, I am not urging you to read it. We leave it to you to decide.

MR. hOBERTS: In view of the statement made
I am inclined to finish reading the rest of the paragraph. It follows:

"However, in substance the military administration fells under matters of state, and at present various matters, such as the laying of plans, actually come under organs of state in many cases. This Article was inserted in order to provide that the disposal of such cases would be the responsibility of the Greater East Asia Ministry. 'SAKUO' /T.N. Concert/means compliance with the wishes of the army, while 'KYORYOKU' /T.N. Cooperation/ means non-interference in military administration."

Referring back to Article XIX in exhibit 90, which is the Imperial ordinance setting up the Greater East Asia Ministry, does the explanation given give us a clearer picture of the intention of Article XIX?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am afraid I must object to that question, your Honor. Both documents speak for themselves.

THE PRESIDENT: But the reference is not to the clause but to an explanation, and I think I would say that he was asked whether he explained fully to you. But what do you mean, Mr. Roberts? Do you ask him whether the clause explains, or whether his explanation was full enough?

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps it will be made more clear if I read the small paragraph preceding the one I have read, which states as follows on page 21:

"Committee member, MINAMI (Hiroshi), requested an explanation of the purport of Art. 19 of the Establishment of the Greater East Asia Ministry."

My question to the witness was to ascertain whether or not the explanation as contained here was not to clarify the meaning of Article XIX.

THE PRESIDENT: The articles themselves con't explain anything. They make provision. MINAMI makes an explanation, according to exhibit 687, page 21. Now,

what do you want? Are you suggesting that Articles

XVIII and XIX must be read together to be understood?

We don't want the witness' assistance on that.

MR. ROBERTS: May I first state that the reference to MINAMI here is not the accused MINAMI.

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is Hiroshi, not Jiro. We quite understand.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to ask the witness if the explanation contained in this clause that I have read is not in accordance with his answer previously.

THE PRESIDENT: They are both in writing. We can come to our own conclusion. Mr. Carr had a liberty in this regard that you didn't have. He could bring these writings up on cross-examination. There is no occasion and no proper scope for you to do it in re-examination.

We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1515, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 11 March 1947, at 0930.)